There have been instances in England where a Cabinet has decided on vital issues to give freedom of opinion and freedom to vote even to the Members of the Cadinet. In the present case even that stage has not been reached because the Cabinet has not considered the question at all. It is also clear from the statement of the Hon'ble Sri Kadidal Manjappa and Hon'ble the Chief Minister that while differing views may have been expressed by them nobody is carrying on or intending to carry on any agitation for supporting a particular point of view. The expression of opinion is merely in the nature of personal view. This has been so from the beginning and as observed by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister the views of the three signatories to the statement have been well known for quite some time past. I may however state that in the interests of good administration and the building up of healthy traditions, it is always desirable for Ministers not to give public expression to views which are admittedly at variance with the views expressed by the Leader, particularly on such vital issues.

The question now requiring decision is in short one of admissibility. Of the three conditions to be fulfilled before a motion can be held to be *prima facie* admissible, we may concede that the matter is of definite and of public importance. But from what I have stated above, it is clear that it is not urgent.

If we look at the terms of the motion it will become clear that no useful purpose will be served in the present context by permitting the adjournment motion to be moved and a discussion to take place. Such a discussion will merely result in a theoretical and academic discussion of constitutional conventi ns and propriety.

No doubt under article 164(2) of the Constitution, the Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly. This provision, as it were, imports into our Constitution several of the Constitutional conventions that have developed in England about Parliamentary supremacy and collective responsibility. These conventions however affect the Legislature only in regard to arrangement and conduct of business in the House. Except in certain circumstances, these conventions have to be fostered and built up primarily by the parties which compose the House. It is usual for the members who compose a majority party to decide whether a particular leader commands their confidence in the circumstances that exist within the party or within the Cabinet. These conventions cannot be enforced by means of a discussion on an adjournment motion.

The Hon'ble Sri J. Mahomed Imam in supporting the motion stated that there was no other opportunity available for him to debate this subject and that therefore this motion should be admitted. It is needless for me to point out that under our Constitution and our Rules of Procedure there are other avenues open to Hon'ble Members to discuss this subject more effectively and decisively.

I therefore hold that this motion fails on the ground of urgency and it is out of order.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 4) BILL, 1955.

Introduction.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No.4 Bill, 1955 which has been published in the *Mysore Gazette* Extraordinary dated 17th October 1955 under Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

Motion to consider.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move:

> "That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I made a brief statement while placing these demands before the